arXiv:1512.08585v1 [astro-ph.IM] 29 Dec 2015

International Astronomical Consortium for High-Energy Calibration

IACHEC Report 2015

Summary of the 10th IACHEC Meeting

Xiaobo Li[a], Shu Zhang[a], Catherine Grant[b], Matteo Guainazzi[c,d], Eric Miller[b], Lorenzo Natalucci[e], Jukka Nevalainen[f], on behalf of the IACHEC
([a]Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, PRC
[b]MIT Kavli Institute for Astrophysics and Space Research, Cambridge, U.S.A.
[c]European Space Astronomy Centre of ESA, Madrid, Spain
[d]Institute of Space and Astronomical Science, Sagamihara, Japan
[e]Istituto di Astrofisica e Planetologia Spaziali, INAF, Roma, Italy
[f]University of Tartu, Estonia)

December 31, 2015

Abstract

We summarize the outcome of the 10th meeting of the International Astronomical Consortium for High Energy Calibration (IACHEC), held in Beijing (People's Republic of China) in April 2015. Over 80 scientists directly involved in the calibration of operational and future high-energy missions gathered during 3.5 days to discuss the status of the X-ray payload inter-calibration, as well as possible ways to improve it. A recent study on a large sample of galaxy clusters confirmed that the calibration of the effective area shape above 2 keV between *XMM-Newton*/EPIC and *Chandra*/ACIS is consistent, but showed a significant discrepancy at lower energies. Temperatures measured by EPIC are therefore smaller, the difference being largest for the highest temperatures, up to $\simeq$20% at kT=10 keV (Schellenberger et al. 2015). The latest multi-mission study of the Crab Nebula above 10 keV shows a $\pm$13% agreement in the relative normalization of the INTEGRAL, NuSTAR, RXTE, and *Suzaku* hard X-ray instruments.

The International Astronomical Consortium for High Energy Calibration (IACHEC)[1] is a group dedicated to supporting the cross-calibration environment of high energy astrophysics missions with the ultimate goal of maximizing their scientific return. Its members are drawn from instrument teams, international and national space agencies and other scientists with an interest in calibration in this area. Representatives of over a dozen current and future missions regularly contribute to the IACHEC activities. Support for the IACHEC in the form of travel costs for the participating members is generously provided by the relevant funding agencies.

IACHEC members cooperate within working groups to define calibration standards and procedures. The scope of these groups is primarily a practical one: a set of data and results (eventually

[1] `http://web.mit.edu/iachec/`

published in refereed journals) will be the outcome of a coordinated and standardized analysis of reference sources ("high-energy standard candles"). Past, present and future high-energy missions can use these results as a calibration reference. The 10th IACHEC meeting was successfully hosted by HXMT team during April 20–23 2015 at the Fragrant Hill of Beijing. It turns out to be the IACHEC with the largest number of participants so far. 85 scientists covering a diversity of nationalities, including China, US, Germany, Spain, Italy, India, Japan, and Estonia, joined this meeting and shared their experience on calibration of operational as well as future missions.

At the end of the nominal meeting, a mini-workshop was held at IHEP to discuss the calibration status and plans of the Hard X-ray Modulation Telescope. Six IACHEC participants out of China attended this mini-workshop as experts. The event was highly successful. It could represent a precedent to increase the efficiency and impact of future IACHEC meetings.

1 Working Group reports

1.1 CCD

The CCD Working Group again met in conjunction with the Backgrounds Working Group due to substantial overlap in interested participants. As always, the CCD Working Group provided a forum for cross-mission discussion and comparison of CCD-specific modeling and calibration issues, while the Backgrounds Working Group provides the same for measuring and modeling instrument backgrounds in the spatial, spectral and temporal dimensions. At IACHEC 2015, we heard from *Chandra*/ACIS, *Chandra*/ACIS/HETG, and *XMM-Newton*/EPIC-pn.

We started the session with presentations on ACIS calibration and background. Nick Durham summarized work using the ACIS external calibration source (radio-isotope Fe-55 plus Al and Ti fluorescence targets). He is evaluating a variety of calibrated quantities as a function of time and focal plane temperature, such as line centroid and width, quantum efficiency uniformity across the CCDs, and the spatial distribution of the contamination on the ACIS filters. Terry Gaetz spoke on efforts to improve the accuracy of the low-energy gain on the ACIS BI CCDs using Low-Energy Transmission Gratings spectra, and also on a preliminary investigation into ACIS background flares and their frequency. Improvements for the ACIS-S1 low-energy gain based on this work will be released shortly in CALDB 4.6.9. He also found that while the fraction of time during background flares is higher during solar maximum than minimum, the current solar maximum has a much lower flaring fraction than the previous one.

Matteo Guainazzi and Norbert Schultz both gave presentations on a multi-observatory calibration effort to better understand the EPIC-pn response to bright sources at low energies and more generally, CCD redistribution in specialized timing modes. *Chandra*/HETG, *XMM-Newton*, and *Swift* all simultaneously observed the bright obscured X-ray binary Cyg X-3. The *Chandra* HETG line energies can then be fed back into the CCD spectra to better calibrate the energy scale, while comparison of low energy residuals can feed into improved low energy redistribution models.

Finally, Michael Smith discussed the EPIC-pn energy scale and the quiescent background. After adjusting event energies with the long-term CTI correction calibrated using the on-board calibration

source, there is a residual secular trend that is strongly correlated with the quiescent background. The residual secular trend is not due to CTI, but is a background-dependent gain effect. SAS implementation and scientific validation of an additional background-dependent gain correction is in progress.

1.2 Contamination

The contamination Working Group held its second face-to-face meeting at the 2015 IACHEC workshop, gathering 6 of 20 WG members and several additional non-members for a single session. The group discussed the affects of molecular contamination (Marshall et al. 2004, Koyama et al. 2007, O'Dell et al., 2013) on soft X-ray ($\leq$ 1 keV) instruments in light of the three broad topics introduced at the inaugural meeting in 2014:
(1) comparison of contamination among instruments and missions;
(2) mitigation for current instruments; and
(3) mitigation for future instruments.

Representatives from operating missions presented status reports on the contamination in their soft X-ray CCD instruments. Herman Marshall presented new observations of the blazar Mrk 421 with the *Chandra* LETG and ACIS-S array. This "big dither" observation was similar to one performed in 2014, where the pointing direction was dithered by $\pm$64 arcsec in a direction orthogonal to the grating dispersion direction. This dither is much larger than the $\pm$8 arcsec Lissajous dither pattern in standard observing, and allows fine mapping of the contaminant spatial distribution along this direction. The results indicate that the contamination is continuing to build at an increasing rate on ACIS, and appears symmetric top-to-bottom in the ACIS-S array, with more contaminant at the edges of the filter. The oxygen to carbon ratio varies from the center to edge, with possibly two contaminant components responsible. Doug Swartz presented an updated model of contamination migration within *Chandra*, building on previous work constraining the volatility of the contaminants. These results suggest that most of the recently accumulated contamination comes from a second, higher volatility source that has become increasingly active, possibly due to rising temperatures within the *Chandra* Observatory. If the source rate continues to track these temperature trends, then the contamination layer might dramatically increase in the near future. Eric Miller showed updates of the *Suzaku* XIS contamination monitoring, using targets such as SNR 1E 0102.2$-$7219, the isolated neutron star RX J1856.5$-$3754, and the BLLac PKS 2155$-$304. The XIS show no evidence for an accelerated source of contaminant as with *Chandra*, and in fact have continued to show signs of decreasing contamination optical depth. The total effective area at 0.65 keV (the O VIII Lyα line) has been increasing at about 10% per year since 2011.

For upcoming missions, Kallol Mukherjee briefly discussed the possible sources of contamination in the Soft X-ray Telescope (SXT) CCD instrument aboard ASTROSAT, along with plans for initial operations to mitigate early contaminant build-up. There was significant discussion among the working group members about how long to wait before opening the instrument door, what initial targets to point at for a zero-contamination baseline, and what might be expected given the CCD operating temperature and other operational parameters.

Efforts will continue before the next IACHEC meeting to work toward a legacy white paper detailing shared lessons learned about contamination on soft X-ray instruments.

1.3 Galaxy Clusters

1.3.1 Multi-Mission Study

We continued the discussion, started in the previous meeting, about the Multi Mission Study project, which currently consists of comparing X-ray spectroscopic results of four clusters obtained with on-going and past X-ray missions/instruments *XMM-Newton*/EPIC, *Chandra*/ACIS, *Swift*/XRT, *Suzaku*/XIS and ROSAT/PSPC.

While we do have preliminary results indicating significant patterns in the behavior of the cross-calibration, we need help with interpreting them. Our aim is to utilize the collective IACHEC experience on the involved instruments and their calibration. We challenge anyone interested to respond to our related "Request to the IACHEC community" found in the project page[2] We aim for a refereed publication on the topic before the next IACHEC meeting.

We discussed about the possibility of extending the "Multi Mission Study" cluster data base to include NuSTAR mission and the near-future Astro-H, Astrosat and eROSITA missions. This data base could be very valuable for the 0.5-10 keV band effective area calibration of the future missions. We are currently negotiating with the calibration teams of the above missions about including our cluster sample as calibration targets. If this turns out to be infeasible, we will proceed via Guest Observer programs.

1.3.2 Stack residuals ratio

Our basic tool for evaluating the effective area cross-calibration uncertainties is the stack residuals ratio method (e.g. Kettula et al., 2013; Schellenberger et al., 2015). The method is applicable to other astronomical targets as well. We started discussions about applying it to the blazar data obtained via simultaneous *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* observations (Smith & Marshall, in preparation). If we find similar *XMM-Newton*/*Chandra* cross-calibration uncertainties using galaxy clusters or blazars, as expected, we will yield additional confidence on our methods. This in turn would result in a larger statistical sample for the cross-calibration work and thus better precision for the calibration.

1.3.3 HIFLUGCS follow-up

We discussed a possible follow-up cross-calibration work using the *XMM-Newton*/*Chandra* HIFLUGCS cluster sample (Schellenberger et al., 2015, see also the catalog[3]). The larger sample of hot clusters and the additional exposure time, compared to that in Nevalainen et al., (2010) could be used to improve the Fe XXV/XXVI emission line ratio diagnostics. The line ratio measurement yields the estimate of the ionization temperature which, due to the very narrow energy band used, is independent on the accuracy of the effective area shape calibration. Comparison with

[2] `https://wikis.mit.edu/confluence/display/iachec/MMS`

[3] `http://vizier.u-strasbg.fr/viz-bin/VizieR?-meta.foot&-source=J/A%2bA/575/A30`

the continuum-based bremsstrahlung temperature (affected by the effective area calibration accuracy) yields an additional tool for estimating the calibration accuracy. For cool clusters there is also a possibility of using the emission lines of sulfur (S XV and S XVI) and silicon (Si XIII and Si XIV) for the temperature measurements.

1.3.4 Cluster X-ray and gravitational lensing masses as calibrators

Inspired by an IACHEC-related paper (Israel et al., 2015), we discussed the comparison of cluster masses obtained with X-rays with those obtained with gravitational lensing. Unfortunately the situation has not improved from what we reported last year; the possible existence of non-thermal pressure in clusters would induce a hydrostatic bias with similar effect on the X-ray masses as caused by the *XMM-Newton*/*Chandra* effective area cross-calibration uncertainties. A possible near-future solution could be achieved with Astro-H measurements of the non-thermal component via the broadening of the Fe XXV emission lines in clusters.

1.4 Heritage

This Working Group aims at preserving the IACHEC corpus of knowledge, know-how and best practices for the benefit of future missions and the community at large. Its main goals are:

- provide a platform for the discussion of experiences coming from operational missions
- facilitate the usage of good practices for the management of pre- and post-flight calibration data and procedures, and the maintenance and propagation of systematic uncertainties (the latter task in strict collaboration with the "Calibration uncertainties" IACHEC Working Group)
- document the best practices in analyzing high-energy astronomical data as a reference for the whole scientific community
- ensure the usage of homogeneous data analysis procedures across the IACHEC calibration and cross-calibration activities
- consolidate and disseminate the experience of operational missions on the optimal calibration sources for each specific calibration goal

The activity for the following term will concentrate on:

- publishing a paper on the in-flight calibration plans of currently operational mission on the Journal of Astronomical Telescope, Instruments and Systems (Guainazzi et al., in preparation)
- producing a summary of "best-practices" as far as a) photoelectric absorption models and associated cross- sections; b) elemental abundance tables; c) optically thin equilibrium emission plasma codes, and benchmark the effects (if any) of different prescriptions [a)+b)] on the calibration results

- populating the repository of calibration documents on the WG Wiki[4]
- build a IACHEC knowledge database

1.5 Non-thermal SNRs

A meeting of the Non-thermal SNR group was held, attended by calibration scientists from different missions with a significant share of Chinese representatives. The attendees list is the following: Juan-Ha Wang, Haihui Zhao, Xin Zhou, Dipankar Bhattacharya, Yoshitomo Maeda, Michael Smith, Fangjun Lu, Paul Plucinsky, Xi Long, Lorenzo Natalucci, Mingyu Ge. In addition, Kristin Madsen participated remotely (Skype).

The group addressed first the cross-calibration on the hard X-ray band, using the Crab Nebula as a reference source. This effort includes the analysis of data from *Suzaku* (XIS,HXD), RXTE (PCA) *XMM-Newton* (EPIC-pn), INTEGRAL (IBIS,SPI) and NuSTAR. Updates since year 2014 include new assessments of calibrations for NuSTAR (Madsen et al. 2015) and for IBIS/ISGRI (Savchenko et al. 2014). A simultaneous *XMM-Newton*/NuSTAR/INTEGRAL observation took place in November 2014. For *XMM-Newton*, the data were taken from EPIC-pn in burst mode and a possible update of the burst mode calibration will follow.

Progress on the analysis was achieved by the addition of new data sets from most recent periods, yielding a total of 11 nearly simultaneous epochs up to November 2014. The new observations also include data from NuSTAR. The multi-instrument fits from single epochs show evidence of a break at high energies (near 100 keV) by SPI and HXD/GSO. The HXD normalizations are generally found to be higher than INTEGRAL ($\simeq$13% and 8% for the PIN and GSO, respectively), while the PCA lies in between ($\simeq$6%). The NuSTAR normalization is significantly lower than the INTEGRAL one ($\simeq$12%).

The results obtained from the Crab are broadly consistent with the ones reported by Tsujimoto et al. (2011) from observations of G21.5-0.9. However, the relative spread in the measured flux values is significantly wider in the case of G21.5-0.9. For this source, a break at 9 keV was reported by NuSTAR (Nynka et al. 2014), which is the possible explanation for the above discrepancy. It was noted that in the Tsujimoto et al. paper a clear difference emerges between values of the spectral slope measured independently in the soft and hard band. A natural explanation of this effect would be the presence of the 9 keV spectral break, and not an instrumental bias. A test of the new model against *Chandra*, NuSTAR and INTEGRAL is planned.

Finally, Mingyu Ge presented new results for Crab timing mostly obtained from analysis of RXTE data. The analysis shows clear evidence for a phase lag between the X-ray and radio pulses, increasing with time. M. Smith presented results obtained by *XMM-Newton*. A discussion followed on whether it could be possible to use other instruments data (e.g. INTEGRAL) to confirm these results.

[4] `https://wikis.mit.edu/confluence/display/iachec/IACHEC+Heritage+Working+Group`

2 Cross-calibration status

The latest IACHEC cross-calibration study was published by Schellenberger et al. (2015). These authors discuss an update of the cross-calibration status between the *Chandra*/ACIS and the *XMM-Newton*/EPIC, based on a large sample of galaxy clusters. This study confirms previous results in, *e.g.*, Nevalainen et al. (2010). The calibration of the effective area shape above 2 keV between EPIC and ACIS is consistent, but there is a significant problem at lower energies resulting in significantly smaller EPIC temperatures. The temperature difference is bigger for the highest temperatures, amounting to $\simeq$20% at kT=10 keV. Readers are refereed to Sect. 2 of Burrows et al. (2014) for a summary of the cross-calibration status among operational missions based on samples of point-like sources (cf. their Fig. 4).

References[5]

Burrows et al., 2014, IACHEC Report 2014[6]
Kettula et al., 2013, A&A, 552, 47
Koyama et al., 2007, PASJ, 59, 23
Israel et al., 2015, MNRAS, 448, 814
Madsen et al. 2015, ApJ Suppl., 220, 8
Marshall et al., 2004, in Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, Vol. 5165, X-Ray and Gamma-Ray Instrumentation for Astronomy XIII, ed. K. A. Flanagan & O. H. W. Siegmund, 497–508
Nevalainen et al., 2010, A&A, 523, 22
Nynka et al. 2014, ApJ 789, 72
ODell et al., 2013, in Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, Vol. 8859, UV, X-Ray, and Gamma-Ray Space Instrumentation for Astronomy XVIII, ed. O. H. W. Siegmund, 88590F
Savchenko et al. 2014, Proceedings of Science, PoS(Integral2014)083
Schellenberger et al., 2015, A&A. 575, 30
Tsujimoto et al. 2011, A&A 525, 25

[5] see `http://web.mit.edu/iachec/papers/index.html` for a complete list of IACHEC papers
[6] available at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1412.6233`